



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,473	12/15/2003	Joseph John Fatula JR.	SJO920030066US1	3484
45216	7590	08/16/2007	EXAMINER	
Kunzler & McKenzie 8 EAST BROADWAY SUITE 600 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			LIU, LIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/16/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

88

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/736,473	FATULA, JOSEPH JOHN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Lin Liu	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/15/2003</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communications filed on 12/15/2003.

Claims 1-37 are pending and have been examined.

2. The information disclosure statement (I.D.S) filed on December 15, 2003 is considered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims **26-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. There is no description of the "computer readable storage medium" as recited on claims 26-36, disclosed in the specification.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims **7, 25 and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention. The instant claims recites the term "similar to" it is vague and indefinite as what the applicant refers to as.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. **Claims 1-37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With regard to **claim 1**, the instant claim is directed towards a management apparatus formed with a user input module, a parameter module, and a reservation module, all of these components could be implemented in software alone. Claim directed towards software alone is per se nonstatutory. Claims 2-13 are rejected under the same rationale as of claim 1.

With regard to **claim 14**, the instant claim is directed towards a management apparatus formed with a user input module, an allocation module, a profile management module, and a profile synchronization module, all of these components could be implemented in software alone. Claim directed towards software alone is per se nonstatutory. Claims 15-18 are rejected under the same rationale as of claim 14.

With regard to **claim 19**, the instant claim is directed towards a control system formed with two management apparatuses, a user input module, an allocation module, and a reservation module, all of these components could be implemented in software

Art Unit: 2145

alone. Claim directed towards software alone is per se nonstatutory. Claims 20-21 are rejected under the same rationale as of claim 19.

With regard to **claim 37**, the instant claim is directed towards an apparatus with means for functions, wherein means for allowing user input, means for dynamically changing, and means for reserving can all be implemented by software alone. Claim directed towards software alone is per se nonstatutory.

With regard to **claims 26-36**, the instant claims are directed toward a computer readable storage medium comprising computer readable code, wherein the computer readable storage medium is not defined in the specification, thus the computer readable storage medium can be transmission signal or carrier wave per se, which is nonstatutory.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 1-5, 8-10, 19, 22, 23, 26-28, 31-33 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Talwar et al. (publication no.: US 2005/0027863 A1)**.

Consider **claim 1**, Talwar teaches a global on-demand management apparatus for user control of a system resource on a grid computing system (Talwar, fig. 1, page 1, paragraph 12), the apparatus comprising:

a global user input module configured to allow a user to input a parameter control request (Talwar, page 1 paragraph 12, and page 2, paragraph 16, noted the DRM node receives inputs), the parameter control request corresponding to a performance parameter of the grid computing system (Talwar, page 1, paragraph 12, noted that information service stores information about resources in the system);

a global parameter module configured to dynamically change the performance parameter according to the parameter control request, the performance parameter corresponding to a performance resource (Talwar, page 2 paragraphs 16-17, and page 3 paragraph 28, noted that the SLA/contract generation engine can dynamically generate the available resource for the clients based on the client's request); and

a global reservation module configured to reserve the performance resource for a grid computing operation (Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16 and page 3 paragraph 28, noted that the DRM module matches the user's requirement in order to reserve and allocate available resource to interact with end-user.).

Consider **claims 2 and 3**, Talwar teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the performance parameter is a network performance parameter, wherein the network performance parameter is one of network accessibility, network bandwidth allocation, and grid allocation hierarchy (Talwar, page 2, paragraphs 16-17, noted that the SLA specifies network bandwidth requirements needed for the session to interact with client).

Consider **claims 4 and 5**, Talwar teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the performance parameter is a client performance parameter, wherein the client performance parameter is one of client accessibility, client bandwidth allocation, processor allocation, storage allocation, memory allocation, backup recoverability, and backup proximity (Talwar, page 2, paragraphs 20-22, noted that the user specifies the bandwidth and other resources needed for the requested session).

Consider **claim 8**, Talwar teaches the apparatus of claim 1, further comprising a global profile management module configured to store a network profile (Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16 and paragraph 23, noted the authorization policies), the network profile comprising a network performance parameter of a network performance resource available to the grid computing system (Talwar, page 2, paragraphs 16-17).

Consider **claim 9**, Talwar teaches the apparatus of claim 1, further comprising a global profile management module configured to store a global client profile, the global client profile descriptive of a global client performance resource parameter (Talwar, page 3, paragraph 28, noted the user membership directory).

Consider **claim 10**, Talwar teaches the apparatus of claim 1, further comprising a global profile management module configured to store a plurality of client profiles, each of the plurality of client profiles comprising a client performance parameter of a client performance resource available to the grid computing system (Talwar, page 3, paragraph 28, noted the user membership directory).

Consider **claim 19**, Talwar teaches a system for user control of a system resource on a grid computing system, the system comprising:

a local on-demand management apparatus connected to the grid computing system, the local on-demand apparatus having local access to and control of a performance resource (Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16, and page 3 paragraph 28, noted that the end-user submits request to DRM module and specifies a list of desired application/resource to interact with);

a global on-demand management apparatus connected to the grid computing system, the global on-demand apparatus configured to communicate with the local on-demand apparatus (Talwar, page 1 paragraph 12, and page 2, paragraph 16, noted the DRM node receives request from end-user);

a user input module configured to allow a user to input a parameter control request, the parameter control request corresponding to the performance resource (Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16, and page 3 paragraph 28, noted that the end-user submits request to interact with DRM module);

an allocation module configured to allocate the performance resource to the grid computing system; and a reservation module configured to reserve the performance resource for a grid computing operation (Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16 and page 3 paragraph 28, noted that the DRM module matches the user's requirement in order to reserve and allocate available resource to interact with end-user).

Consider **claim 22**, Talwar teaches a method for user control of a system resource on a grid computing system, the method comprising:

allowing a user to input a parameter control request, the parameter control request corresponding to a performance parameter of the grid computing system



(Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16, and page 3 paragraph 28, noted that the end-user submits request and specifies a list of desired application/resource to interact with);

dynamically changing the performance parameter according to the parameter control request, the performance parameter corresponding to a performance resource (Talwar, page 3, paragraphs 27-28, noted that the contract engine, which is based on the end-user's request can be generated dynamically); and

reserving the performance resource for a grid computing operation (Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16 and page 3 paragraph 28, noted that the DRM module matches the user's requirement in order to reserve and allocate available resource to interact with end-user).

Regarding **Claims 23**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 8**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 8** applies equally as well to **claim 23**.

Regarding **Claims 26**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 22**, but rather in a computer program module. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 22** applies equally as well to **claim 26**.

Regarding **Claims 27**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 3**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 3** applies equally as well to **claim 27**.

Regarding **Claims 28**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 5**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 5** applies equally as well to **claim 28**.

Regarding **Claims 31**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 8**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 8** applies equally as well to **claim 31**.

Regarding **Claims 32**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 9**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 9** applies equally as well to **claim 32**.

Regarding **Claims 33**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 10**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 10** applies equally as well to **claim 33**.

Regarding **Claims 37**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 22**, but rather in means for function form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 22** applies equally as well to **claim 37**.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2145

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
13. Claims 6, 7, 12, 13, 20, 21, 24, 29, 30, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Talwar et al. (publication no.: US 2005/0027863 A1)** in view of **Lumelsky et al. (patent no.: US 6,460,082 A1)**.

With regard to **claim 6**, Talwar teaches all the claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a method of terminating the reservation of the performance resource in response to a client reclamation operation, the client reclamation operation reclaiming the performance resource and making the performance resource unavailable to the grid computing system.

In the same field of endeavor, Lumelsky teaches a method of terminating the reservation of the performance resource in response to a client reclamation operation, the client reclamation operation reclaiming the performance resource (Lumelsky, col. 11, lines 31-56, noted that a new policy can be generated in re-claiming the resource).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of reclaiming a new resource in the distributed system as taught by Lumelsky in Talwar's invention in order to optimize and maximize the usage of the available resource.

With regard to **claim 7**, Talwar teaches all the claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a reserving another performance resource for the grid computing operation, the other performance resource similar to the reclaimed performance resource.

In the same field of endeavor, Lumelsky teaches a method of reserving another performance resource for the grid computing operation (Lumelsky, col. 11, lines 31-56, noted that a new policy can be generated in re-claiming new resource).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of reclaiming a new resource in the distributed system as taught by Lumelsky in Talwar's invention in order to optimize and maximize the usage of the available resource.

With respect to **claim 12**, Talwar teaches all the claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a method of storing a plurality of profile histories, each of the plurality of profile histories comprising a history of a performance parameter resource.

In the same field of endeavor, Lumelsky teaches a method of storing a plurality of profile histories (Lumelsky, col. 4, lines 14-22, noted the usage history).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of storing a plurality of profile histories as taught by Lumelsky in Talwar's invention in order to calculate cost of service for clients (Lumelsky, col. 4, lines 21-22).

With respect to **claim 13**, Talwar teaches all the claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a method of subscribing profile histories to a subscription manager in calculating a client subscription fee based at least in part on the one of the plurality of profile histories.

In the same field of endeavor, Lumelsky teaches a method subscribing profile histories to a subscription manager in calculating a client subscription fee based at least in part on the one of the plurality of profile histories (Lumelsky, col. 4, lines 14-22, noted that the history of resource consumption service is used to calculate the cost of service for clients).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method subscribing profile histories to a subscription manager in calculating a client subscription fee as taught by Lumelsky in Talwar's invention in order to precisely calculate the service fee for clients.

Regarding **Claims 20**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 13**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 13** applies equally as well to **claim 20**.

With respect to **claim 21**, Talwar teaches all the claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a method of subscribing to a subscription manager to manage the allocated performance resource and to control the level of service available to the local on-demand management apparatus.

In the same field of endeavor, Lumelsky teaches a method of subscribing to a subscription manager to manage the allocated performance resource (Lumelsky, col. 4, lines 14-22, noted that the history of resource consumption service is used to calculate the cost of service for clients) and to control the level of service available to the local on-demand management apparatus (Lumelsky, col. 4, lines 23-29, noted the QoS).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of controlling the level of service available as taught by Lumelsky in Talwar's invention in order to the best QoS to the clients.

Regarding **Claims 24**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 6**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 6** applies equally as well to **claim 24**.

Regarding **Claims 29**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 6**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 6** applies equally as well to **claim 29**.

Regarding **Claims 30**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 7**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 7** applies equally as well to **claim 30**.

Regarding **Claims 35**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 12**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 12** applies equally as well to **claim 35**.

Regarding **Claims 36**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 13**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 13** applies equally as well to **claim 36**.

14. Claims 11, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Talwar et al. (publication no.: US 2005/0027863 A1)** in view of **Bartlett et al. (publication no.: US 2004/0064480 A1)**.

With respect to **claim 11**, Talwar teaches all the claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a method of synchronizing one of the stored client profiles with a local client profile stored on a client.

In the same field of endeavor, Bartlett teaches a method synchronizing one of the stored client profiles with a local client profile stored on a client (Bartlett, page 13, paragraph 175).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of synchronizing the stored client profiles with a local client profile stored on a client as taught by Bartlett in Talwar's invention in order to update the latest information of the clients.

With respect to **claim 14**, Talwar teaches a local on-demand management apparatus for user control of a system resource on a grid computing system (Talwar, fig. 2), the apparatus comprising:

a client user input module configured to allow a user to input a client parameter control request (Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16, and page 3 paragraph 28, noted that the end-user submits request to interact with DRM module), the parameter control request corresponding to a client performance parameter of the grid computing system, the client performance parameter corresponding to a client performance resource (Talwar,

page 3, paragraph 28, noted that the end-user specifies a list of desired application/resource to interact with);

a client allocation module configured to allocate the client performance resource to the grid computing system (Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16 and page 3 paragraph 28, noted that the end-user launches applications to interact with the remote execution node);

a client profile management module configured to store a client profile, the client profile comprising the client performance parameter of the client performance resource allocated to the grid computing system (Talwar, page 3, paragraph 28, noted the user membership directory); and

However, Talwar does not explicitly teach a method of synchronizing the client performance parameter with one of a plurality of client profiles.

In the same field of endeavor, Bartlett teaches a method synchronizing one of the stored client profiles with a local client profile stored on a client (Bartlett, page 13, paragraph 175).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of synchronizing the stored client profiles with a local client profile stored on a client as taught by Bartlett in Talwar's invention in order to update the latest information of the clients.

With respect to **claim 15**, Talwar teaches the apparatus of claim 14, further comprising a client parameter module configured to dynamically change the client performance parameter according to the client parameter control request (Talwar, page



3, paragraphs 27-28, noted that the contract engine, which is based on the end-user's request can be generated dynamically).

With respect to **claim 17**, Talwar teaches the apparatus of claim 14, wherein the client user input module receives the client parameter control request from the global on-demand apparatus (Talwar, page 2, paragraph 16).

With respect to **claim 18**, Talwar teaches the apparatus of claim 14, wherein the client performance parameter is one of client accessibility, client bandwidth allocation, processor allocation, storage allocation, memory allocation, backup recoverability, and backup proximity (Talwar, page 2, paragraphs 20-22, noted that the end-user specifies the bandwidth and other resources needed for the requested session).

Regarding **Claims 34**, the claim limitations of this claim is substantially the same as those in **claim 11**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 11** applies equally as well to **claim 34**.

15. Claims 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Talwar et al. (publication no.: US 2005/0027863 A1)** in view of **Bartlett et al. (publication no.: US 2004/0064480 A1)** and **Lumelsky et al. (patent no.: US 6,460,082 A1)**.

With respect to **claim 16**, the combined method of Talwar and Bartlett teaches all the claimed limitations, except that they do not explicitly teach a method of reclaiming the client performance resource and make the client performance resource unavailable to the grid computing system in response to a client reclamation operation.

In the same field of endeavor, Lumelsky teaches a method of reclaiming the client performance resource and make the client performance resource unavailable to the grid computing system in response to a client reclamation operation (Lumelsky, col. 11, lines 31-56, noted that a new policy can be generated in re-claiming the resource).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of reclaiming a new resource in the distributed system as taught by Lumelsky in the combined method of Talwar and Bartlett invention in order to optimize and maximize the usage of the available resource.

With respect to **claim 25**, Talwar teaches a method for user control of a system resource on a grid computing system, the method comprising:

allowing a user to input a parameter control request, the parameter control request corresponding to a performance parameter of the grid computing system (Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16, and page 3 paragraph 28, noted that the end-user submits request and specifies a list of desired application/resource to interact with);

dynamically changing the performance parameter according to the parameter control request, the performance parameter corresponding to a performance resource (Talwar, page 3, paragraphs 27-28, noted that the contract engine, which is based on the end-user's request can be generated dynamically);

reserving the performance resource for a grid computing operation (Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16 and page 3 paragraph 28, noted that the DRM module matches the user's requirement in order to reserve and allocate available resource to interact with end-user);

storing a network profile (Talwar, page 2 paragraph 16 and paragraph 23, noted the authorization policies), the network profile comprising a network performance parameter of a network performance resource available to the grid computing system (Talwar, page 2, paragraphs 16-17);

storing a global client profile, the global client profile descriptive of a global client performance resource parameter (Talwar, page 3, paragraph 28, noted the user membership directory);

storing a plurality of client profiles, each of the plurality of client profiles comprising a client performance parameter of a client performance resource available to the grid computing system (Talwar, page 3, paragraph 28, noted the user membership directory).

However, Talwar does not explicitly teach a method of terminating the reservation of the performance resource in response to a client reclamation operation, the client reclamation operation reclaiming the performance resource and making the performance resource unavailable to the grid computing system; reserving another performance resource for the grid computing operation, the other performance resource similar to the reclaimed performance resource; and synchronizing one of the stored client profiles with a local client profile stored on a client.

In the same field of endeavor, Lumelsky teaches a method of terminating the reservation of the performance resource in response to a client reclamation operation, the client reclamation operation reclaiming the performance resource and reserving

Art Unit: 2145

another performance resource for the grid computing operation, (Lumelsky, col. 11, lines 31-56, noted that a new policy can be generated in re-claiming the new resource).

The combined method of Talwar and Lumelsky does not explicitly teach the method of synchronizing one of the stored client profiles with a local client profile stored on a client.

In the same field of endeavor, Bartlett teaches a method synchronizing one of the stored client profiles with a local client profile stored on a client (Bartlett, page 13, paragraph 175).

### ***Conclusion***

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Martins et al. (publication no.: US 2005/0125537 A1) disclose a method for resource sharing in grid computing networks.
- McDermott et al. (Pub. No.: US 2005/0044226 A1) disclose a method for validating and ranking resources for geographic mirroring.
- Pandya et al. (pub. No.: US 2004/0153545 A1) disclose a method for managing a distributed network.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lin Liu whose telephone number is (571) 270-1447.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm, EST.

Art Unit: 2145

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

L. Liu  
08/07/2007

  
JASON CARDONE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER